

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.30pm
on Wednesday 15 April 2015**

Present: Mrs M Wilson (Chairman for the meeting), Mr D Hunter, Mr B Rufford and Dr C Rowe

Also present: 4 residents (all for part of the meeting)

In attendance: Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

1 Apologies and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Mrs T Cornish, Mrs F Rogers and Mr D Wilson. Mrs Wilson, as Vice Chairman, chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chairman

There were no declarations of interest.

2 Period of Public Participation

Residents raised and spoke about one matter on the Agenda:

Planning:

DC/15/1227/FUL: Proposed single storey front extension and 1½ storey rear extension: Holly Lodge, Martlesham Road

The applicant explained that the front extension was a conservatory.

The neighbours on the east side of the property said that they had no objection to the extension in principle but had concern that it overlooked their garden and the side of their house. The boundary between the properties was a natural hedge, some six to seven feet high, which had been trimmed recently to thicken it up. It would not prevent overlooking, especially in winter, and would not prevent a view from the first floor extension into their property. There would be a view straight across into their garden and behind the private area of their house. They are not currently overlooked and this would add to the loss of privacy that had resulted from the building of Holly Lodge some 20 years ago. When they had extended their own property they had been required to install velux windows to protect their neighbours' privacy and they wanted the same restriction imposed on this development. In their view the development breached LDF policy DM23 in overlooking their property and affecting their amenity.

The applicants stated that they could install frosted glass along the side of the balcony to solve the problem, and net curtains or blinds. As their bedroom would be here they also wanted privacy. However, they did want a view down their garden, hence the balcony. There was not room to move the extension to the other side of the property because of large trees.

Mr Hunter suggested that the applicant and neighbours tried to resolve the matter between them.

3 Planning

DC/15/1227/FUL: Proposed single storey front extension and 1½ storey rear extension: Holly Lodge, Martlesham Road

It was noted that the development did have an impact on the privacy of the neighbouring property, but considered that the principle of an extension was acceptable. It was **RESOLVED** that:

- there was objection to the application on the grounds that the rear extension would overlook Oak Mount and affect its privacy and the development was therefore in breach of LDF policy DM23.

EAOW1

It was noted that government funding for large energy projects had been reduced. The project was therefore to be smaller in scale: the same amount of cabling but an output of 750MW instead of 1200MW. The applicants were seeking approval of 'non-material changes' as a result and had said that all of the changes were minor. However, it was noted that one change would be to connect the project to the national transmission network via onshore cabling which carried high voltage alternative current (HVAC) and not the approved high voltage direct current (HVDC). There were concerns about any health implications and it was **RESOLVED**:

- To express concern and ask the applicant to comment on any health implications involved in onshore cabling carrying HVAC as opposed to HVDC
- To draw the attention of residents to the change by publicising it in the Benefice Magazine

4 Correspondence

Fencing on Boundary of The Grove, The Street

A letter had been received from a former resident, who owned property in the parish, expressing her disturbance at fencing which had been erected adjacent to The Street, along the boundary of The Grove. In her view the fence blighted the landscape and interfered with the natural beauty of the village. A hedge would have been more appropriate and considerate to neighbours. A telephone call from another resident had also been received, expressing similar views.

It was noted that the fence did remove a view across the valley from The Street and considered that the fence was of a height which may require planning permission. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To advise SCDC of residents' concern and enquire whether planning permission was required for the fence.

Banking Mandate Forms

These had been obtained from Barclays Bank, as both Mrs Rogers and Dr Rowe were standing down from the Council and new signatories would be required. There were ten nominations for seven Councillors and an election would therefore be held on 7 May. It was noted that, in order to ensure that cheques could be signed on 11 May, the mandate needed to be completed promptly, and amended again after the election if necessary. Mr Hunter already undertook the quarterly bank reconciliation as a non-signatory and it was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

- Mr Rufford would become a signatory for the Council's Barclays Bank Account, although if those Councillors not present at the meeting already banked with Barclays they would be preferred as they would not need to visit the bank with identification.

20mph for The Street

SCC had confirmed that it would proceed with designing the 20mph limit and it did not consider a site meeting was necessary at this stage to establish the precise extent. However, SCC was concerned that the Council confirmed the funding as soon as possible.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.10pm. The next meeting will be the Annual Parish Council Meeting, to be held on Monday 11 May 2015.